

Dear Editor, dear Reviewer

In response to your request, we have further clarified the two highlighted issues in this revised version of the manuscript. Additionally, we have updated the author affiliations, as already requested by the editorial team in the published companion paper of this article (Part A)

- 7) Line 170. Why the (one-side) truncated Gutenberg-Richter relation is used? Why the  $m_{min}$  is not included? In the rest of the text, contradictions can be seen in this field and the double truncated Gutenberg-Richter relationship is used.

*We have expanded the text to clarify the issue of representing  $M_{min}$  in the Gutenberg-Richter (GR) relationship, addressing the reasons for using the one-sided truncated model in certain cases and explaining how  $M_{min}$  is incorporated in other parts of the analysis where the double-truncated GR relationship is applied.*

*“A lower magnitude cutoff ( $M_{min}$ ) is introduced solely when applying this relationship in the hazard integral, which will be discussed later. Since the relationship is cumulative with respect to increasing magnitudes, this lower truncation does not affect the formulation in Equation (1) or its calibration.”*

- 8) Line 172. Is Gutenberg-Richter's relation applicable for values lower than completeness magnitude?

*We have revised the text to better explain the possibility of extending the Gutenberg-Richter (GR) relationship to magnitudes below the completeness threshold, addressing its general applicability in this context.*

*“It is important to note that the general validity of the GR relationship is often assumed to extend also to magnitudes below the completeness magnitude, which merely defines the data range used for calibrating the relationship's coefficients, without restricting the overall applicability of the formulation.”*